

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated July 11, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4 and 8-12 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1 and 10 have been amended and claims 8, 9 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1, 4, 10, and 11 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,678 to Sakamoto et al. (hereinafter “Sakamoto”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,953 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,957 to Oh et al. (hereinafter “Oh”). Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee and Oh and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,969,872 to Kim (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee and further in view of Kim.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee in view of Oh is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “wherein the pixel electrode and the common electrode are disposed on the same layer, the common electrode and the common line are disposed on layers different from each other so that the common electrode is connected to the common line through a contact hole, wherein the common electrode and the common line are not overlapped with the pixel electrode and the common line is separated a predetermined distance from the end portion of the pixel electrode.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the claimed invention, the common electrode and the common line are not overlapped with the pixel electrode. On the contrary, as shown in Fig. 24 of Sakamoto, the common electrode 305 of Sakamoto is overlapped with the pixel electrode. As shown in Fig. 3C of Lee, Lee disclosed that the common electrode 28 is overlapped with the pixel electrode 30. As shown in Fig. 2A of Oh, Oh disclosed that the common line 103 is overlapped with the pixel electrode

108.

Therefore, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least “the common electrode and the common line are not overlapped with the pixel electrode.”

Further, in the claimed invention, the pixel electrode and the common electrode are formed on the same layer. On the contrary, the pixel electrode and the common electrode are formed on the different layers (that is, the common electrode is disposed on the passivation layer and the pixel electrode is disposed on the gate insulating layer) in Sakamoto and Oh. Further, in Lee the pixel electrode and common electrode are also formed on the different layers (that is, common electrode is formed on the gate insulating layer and the pixel electrode is formed on the passivation). Therefore, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least “the pixel electrode and the common electrode are disposed on the same layer, the common electrode and the common line are disposed on layers different from each other so that the common electrode is connected to the common line through a contact hole.”

In addition, the liquid crystal display device of Sakamoto is an IPS (In-Plane Switching) mode and the liquid crystal display device of Lee is an FFS (Fringe Field Switching) mode. In the IPS mode, the common electrode and the pixel electrode are formed in the strip shape so that the common electrode and the pixel electrode are disposed in parallel each other. On the contrary, in the FFS mode, the pixel electrode is formed in the strip shape and the common electrode is formed in the whole area of the pixel region, so that the pixel electrode is overlapped with the common electrode, not disposed in parallel to each other. Thus, it is improper to combine the liquid crystal display device of the Sakamoto and the Lee, since the structure of Sakamoto and Lee is different from each other.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 4, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee and Oh and further in view of Kim is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation in claims 8 and 9, the rejection is now believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 10 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of elements including “the common electrode and the common line are not overlapped with the pixel electrode and the common line is separated a predetermined distance from the end portion of the pixel electrode.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

As argued to the rejection of claim 1, Sakamto and Lee fail to teach or suggest at least “the common electrode and the common line are not overlapped with the pixel electrode.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 and claim 11, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Lee and further in view of Kim is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation in claim 12, the rejection is now believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: October 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant